

1 John E. McOsker (SBN 169191)  
jmcosker@wallerlaw.com  
2 Stephen K. Lubega (SBN 126849)  
slubega@wallerlaw.com  
3 WALLER LANSDEN DORTCH & DAVIS, LLP  
333 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 1800  
4 Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 362-3680  
5 Facsimile: (213) 362-3679

6 | Attorneys for Defendants Stratasoft, Inc. and INX, Inc.

7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## 1. INTRODUCTION

23 Defendant STRATASOFT is another of several corporate and individual defendants  
24 who have been sued by Plaintiff Noreen Rucinski doing business as “Schneider Rucinski  
25 Enterprises”). As previously pointed out in Defendant INX, Inc.’s motion to dismiss pursuant  
26 to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 12(b)(1), Plaintiff’s invocation of this Court’s diversity jurisdiction  
27 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332 is infirm. Accordingly, Defendant STRATASOFT moves this  
28 Court for an order dismissing the Complaint because, on its face, the Complaint fails to allege

1 facts sufficient to satisfy the “complete diversity” requirements necessary for such subject  
 2 matter jurisdiction. The Complaint establishes that Plaintiff is a citizen of California and that  
 3 at least one of the Defendants is also a citizen of California.

4 **II. ARGUMENT**

5       **A. A Defendant May Challenge the Complaint by Bringing a Motion to**  
 6       **Dismiss Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro 12(b)(1) on the Ground that the**  
 7       **Court Lacks Subject Matter Jurisdiction over the Action**

8 Fed. R. Civ. Pro 12(b)(1) provides that the objection of lack of subject matter  
 9 jurisdiction may be asserted by motion. “A motion asserting [this objection] must be made  
 10 before pleading if a responsive pleading is allowed.” (*See* Fed. R. Civ. Pro 12(b)(1).) The  
 11 Court is required to first rule on the Rule 12(b)(1) objection before ruling on other objections  
 12 made under Rule 12. Lack of subject matter jurisdiction is a non-waivable defect in the  
 13 pleadings because federal diversity cannot be conferred by consent of the parties.

14       **B. The Complaint Facialy Establishes that there is Lack of Complete**  
 15       **Diversity Between Plaintiff and Each of the Defendants**

16 Complete diversity of citizenship is required in order for subject matter jurisdiction to  
 17 exist under the diversity requirements of Title 28 of the United States Code. Federal diversity  
 18 jurisdiction requires that all parties to the action be “citizens of different states.” 28 U.S.C.  
 19 §1332(a). This has been interpreted to mean that each of the plaintiffs must be a citizen of a  
 20 different state than each of the defendants. *Morris v. Princess Cruises, Inc.* 236 F. 3d 1061,  
 21 1067 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001). The burden of establishing diversity jurisdiction is on the plaintiff *to both*  
 22 *plead and prove such facts.* *McNutt v. General Motors Acceptance Corp.*, 298 U.S. 178, 186,  
 23 56 S. Ct. 780, 784-785 (1936); *Bautista v. Pan American World Airways, Inc.* 828 F.2d 546,  
 24 562 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987).

25 Plaintiff Noreen Rucinski fails to plead facts sufficient to establish the existence of  
 26 diversity. Rucinski lists her address as being in San Diego, California. She alleges, in  
 27 Paragraph 1 of the Complaint, that she is the sole proprietor of “Schneider Rucinski  
 28 Enterprises, a California company licensed to conduct business in the County of San Diego,

1 State of California.” It should be noted based on the exhibits attached to the Complaint, that  
 2 “Schneider Rucinski Enterprises” has the same California address as that listed in the caption  
 3 of the Complaint (3344 N. Mt. View Dr., San Diego, CA 92116). The exhibits to the  
 4 Complaint include an “Equipment Lease Agreement,” a “UCC Financing Statement,” and  
 5 various invoices and checks, all of which bear the same California address listed as the  
 6 Plaintiff’s address in the Complaint. Plaintiff’s allegations and the exhibits attached to her  
 7 Complaint suggest that Plaintiff is indeed domiciled in California, and is a California citizen.

8 On the other hand, Plaintiff alleges, in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint, that Defendant  
 9 Rudy Ngaw is an individual *residing* in Sacramento, California, and doing business in the  
 10 County of San Diego. In Paragraph 3, she alleges that Defendant Touch Asia Outsourcing  
 11 Solutions, Inc. (“Touch Asia”) is a corporation *incorporated in California with its principal*  
 12 *place of business in Sacramento, California*, which conducts business in this State. In  
 13 Paragraph 10, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Navros Haji was at all times mentioned *a*  
 14 *resident of California* and doing business in San Diego. In Paragraph 11, she alleges that  
 15 Defendant Colo 6 LLC dba U.S. Colo is a *California corporation with its principal place of*  
 16 *business in Los Angeles, California.*

17 On the face of the Complaint, Plaintiff has alleged facts establishing that there is lack of  
 18 complete diversity between her and at least four of the Defendants. Because Plaintiff bears the  
 19 burden of pleading and proving the facts establishing diversity, and because she has failed to  
 20 meet her pleading burden, the Court must dismiss her Complaint.

21 **III. CONCLUSION**

22 The Court should dismiss this Complaint because Plaintiff failed to meet her pleading  
 23 burden of establishing that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction on the basis of diversity.  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

1  
2 Dated: March 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted

3  
4  
5  
6 WALLER LANSDEN DORTCH & DAVIS, LLP

7 By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

John E. McOske  
Attorneys for Defendants  
Stratasoft, Inc. and INX, Inc.